

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/604,010	Applicant(s) SEIPP, STEVEN J.	
	Examiner Gordon J. Stock	Art Unit 2877	

All Participants:

(1) Gordon J. Stock.

(2) Attorney Sean Sullivan.

Status of Application: after nonfinal

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 October 2007
Time: 11:00am
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Berman (6,347,291) and Gotoh et al. (6,225,011)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Again, a proposed amendment was discussed to overcome the previous art of record. Specifically, claim 1 was discussed to distinguish applicant's alignment routine from Gotoh. Examiner stated that the phrasing of claim 1 does not preclude two types of alignment schemes as mentioned in Gotoh. Examiner suggested amending claim 1's gathering step to state: -gathering alignment data with respect to the patterend substrate from at least the scanning of the first and second areas- and the determining step with -determining substrate position relative to the exposure system from the alignment data-. In addition, Examiner mentioned other prior art that appeared relevant to the proposed amendment of claim 1. The documents mentioned were: U.S. Patent 4,515,480 to Miller et al., U.S. Patent 4,870,288 to Abuku et al., U.S. Patent 5,621,813 to Brown et al., U.S. Patent 4,475,122 to Green, and U.S. Patent 5,696,835 to Hennessey et al..